India

FOR THE

No. 181. New Series.] No. 275. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 289
Waiting for Mr. Chamberlain ... 292
Facts and Hallucinations—II. ... 293
Our London Letter 293
Notes from Bombay 294
Letters to the Editor:
"India in the Nineteenth Century" 294
Europeans and Indians... 295
The Famine in India 295
The Case for Enquiry 296
The Indian Famine Union 296
Some Opinions of the Press 297
Indian Affairs in Parliament 298
The Bishop of Calcutta on British Rule in India 299
Advertisements 300

NOTES AND NEWS.

MR. COURTNEY, as Chairman of the Provisional Committee, and Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. S. S. Thorburn and Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P., as joint honorary secretaries, explain in a letter which appears on another page the purposes and procedure of the Indian Famine Union. The Union, it will be seen, seeks the cooperation (1) of the general public, whose sympathy and support are indispensable; (2) of the many persons in this country—retired officers, civil and military engineers, business men, and missionaries—who have special experience of India, sympathise with the Indian people, and have time at their disposal; and (3) of leading authorities in economic science whose help and advice will be useful "with a view to dealing on sound principles with the difficult problems involved in safeguarding a vast and scattered agricultural population." The Union will begin its work by moving the Secretary of State to grant a special enquiry into the present condition of the Indian cultivator and the origin of his difficulties. It is then proposed to form subcommittees on various suggested means of famine prevention—such as irrigation, agricultural banks, grain storage, and technical instruction—"in order that the Government of India may have the support of an enlightened and organised public opinion." We hardly need to commend these proposals to our readers. Communications should for the present be addressed to the Indian Famine Union, care of Sir William Wedderburn, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

The latest famine telegram from the Viceroy, dated June 12, was not made public here till we had gone to press last week. It gives a total of 484,000 persons in receipt of relief—an increase of 24,000 on the preceding week (June 3). In Bombay there is an increase of 18,000, and in the Bombay Native States, 10,000; while there are small counterbalancing diminutions in Haidarabad and the Central India States. Notwithstanding the increase in Bombay, the Viceroy reports that "the distress in Bombay has been much less than was apprehended." We observe that the official report has taken to expressing the population on relief in percentages. This has the effect of minimising the distress to those who lack imagination to work out the figures; but it ought to be obvious enough that the half million of people on relief derive little mitigation of their lot from the fact that they constitute but one six-hundredth part of the whole population of India. Supposing it was one in six million instead of one in six hundred, would the pangs of the one prove any the less severe?

We are glad to learn that "the monsoon has burst." The message is brief and oracular. We hope, however, that the monsoon will behave well this time, and lift the country out of the slough of despond into which it has been sunk. The people of this country will be anxious for further information; the fuller the better. "With present ranges of prices," the Viceroy's telegram (June 12) stated, "number on relief works may be expected to decline rapidly if monsoon normal and meteorological forecast is justified." It is not so difficult for officialdom to be hopeful; but what we should like to see is some solid ground for such hopefulness. The stress laid on the range of prices agrees with the conclusion that the famine is a famine of money. We should much like to find the Government addressing itself to the problem of famine from some other point of view than vague hopefulness as to the better behaviour of the monsoon.

The "Christian" newspaper publishes useful glimpses of "the grievous condition of the people in a number of districts" under the grip of the famine. It states that a committee recently appointed to enquire into the state of the Bhils in Central India reports thus:—

> Despite the extensive efforts of famine relief during last year, one-quarter to one-half of the people perished. In many cases whole families were exterminated, and in one instance seven out of nine houses were obliterated. The greater part of the domestic animals and wild game died. Owing to lack of seed-grain and animals to till the soil, together with the lateness of the rains, little was sown, and from these and other causes the harvest was largely a failure. Of those people who still remain, the majority have sold all their possessions. At present the food of the people consists of seed gathered in the jungle. There is in prospect a condition of want still greater than that which existed last year, since the people have neither cattle, grain nor saleable articles remaining.

The Rev. Dennis Osborne, writing from Poona (May 17), says that "the condition of the people has grown severer, as was expected," the number on Government relief increasing and "suffering and destitution growing greater." He adds:—

> I pray that God's people in Great Britain may send us speedy relief, for we cannot turn away from the suffering around us. What we need is relief for hungry men, women, and children, and support for the numerous orphans.

Again, the Rev. P. B. Keskar describes the condition of the people in the Sholapur district:—

> Famine has reduced people to beggary, and they will remain in that condition for a long time, or succumb to its effects, unless help is continued to them until better times appear.

What is the answer of "God's people in Great Britain"?

The following descriptive points are taken from a letter in the "East Anglian Daily Times" (June 4) from "the pen of an East Anglian lady," who has seen famine in actual operation:—

> It was quite impossible to get your things moved from one camp to another, for all the bullocks had died and they are the draught beasts! And the heat was awful. T—— said he used to ride about camp all day in his shirt sleeves, and every hour or so absorb a bottle of soda-water. Horse and man were literally dripping. He says he has often seen the grey pony black with perspiration before eight o'clock in the morning. And this would have been enough without the sights and smells! I saw a few—wonderfully few—emaciated persons, and I do assure you it is a sight not easily forgotten. The grown-up people are bad enough, but the babies! Then the cattle died like flies, and the people too, and the bungays, whose duty it was to bury the dead, went on strike. Oh it is too terrible to speak of! T—— said mercifully they got inured to the horror. Indeed, if they had not, I doubt if they could have lived through it. But their hands were full to overflowing, and they had no time to think of the misery of it, for the Englishmen in the thick of it had to be everywhere and do everything. I am very proud of my fellow-countrymen when I think of India, for I have seen them at work there. Famine is the one subject of conversation here, and one gets soaked in it.

If the situation is a "horror" to the onlookers, what can it be to the sufferers?

Some time back we drew attention to the work done by Sir Norman Lockyer and his son Dr. W. J. S. Lockyer on

the relation between sunspots and the recurrence of famine in India. Their studies were, in some measure at least, prompted by the concurrence of the irregularity of Indian rainfall in 1897 with an abnormal behaviour of the sun-spot spectra. "It looks," says Sir Norman, in an article in the "North American Review" on his researches, "as if these enquiries, carried on for some years during which work shall be redoubled in obtaining the necessary solar and terrestrial data, may eventually provide us with materials for a more or less perfect prediction of Indian famine." So far good: a definitive well-grounded warning cannot but be most valuable. Meantime there is but too much ground for assuming an annual famine, and no possible means of prevention or anticipation ought to be neglected.

The Bombay Revenue Bill, according to the "Mahratta," does not contain any provision calculated to remove the defects in the revenue system of which we have lately had experience. Both the "Mahratta" and the "Times of India" are agreed in considering the most important clause in the Bill to be that which limits the owner's right of alienation. Both are agreed that this is a new departure, but while the latter looks upon it as a beneficent beginning of the rescue of the agriculturists from the money-lenders, the former views this policy with considerable distrust. It believes that "the Government are determined upon making the non-transferability of land a condition of land-holding throughout India." It calls on the Government at least to try at the same time some of the other remedies recommended by Indian opinion—remedies which do not evoke the same opposition.

A new work by many hands entitled "The Heart of the Empire" (T. Fisher Unwin) professes to be a series of discussions dealing with modern city life in England. It is, however, an instance of the way in which Imperialism obtrudes itself even into discussions of domestic reform that one long chapter is devoted to "Imperialism." This is entrusted to the competent hands of Mr. G. P. Gooch, well known for his sympathy with oppressed peoples and his firm belief that international relations come within the sphere of ethics. There is much in this chapter, as well as in the other portions of the book, that deserves to arrest our attention. For instance, he draws a very clear distinction between the expansion of Empire by means of colonies, and the much less advantageous enlargements due to conquests over weaker races, and he refutes by an apt quotation the common error that Professor Seeley approved of both kinds of increase. "When a State," said Seeley, "advances beyond the limits of nationality, its power becomes precarious and artificial." But perhaps the part of Mr. Gooch's essay which will most interest our readers is that which relates to India.

Not that in the pages dealing with India there is much that is new. It has all or almost all been said before at the Indian National Congress or in our columns. It is, indeed, surprising to find on how many points an independent observer like Mr. Gooch comes to the same conclusion as the leaders of the Congress party. He remarks on the small attention bestowed on Indian affairs by the English public and the "weight of consecrated precedent" with which all independent suggestions of reform are met. He adds: "No men have had harder battles to fight than Bright, Fawcett, Bradlaugh, and Wedderburn, and the little band of men, in and out of Parliament, who have warred against apathy and ignorance in regard to our great dependency." And those eminent and devoted men have found in Mr. Gooch a worthy exponent of their policy.

Mr. Gooch divides the grievances of India into the economic and the political, the former affecting the whole people, while the latter chiefly or at all events directly concern the educated minority. In both he endorses the complaints that have been so often uttered by the Indian National Congress, the loyalty and moderation of which he vindicates. It is possible that, although he mentions the drain on India as one of her economic grievances he does not fully realise the effect of that drain, as explained by John Stuart Mill, in forcing her to buy dearer and sell cheaper throughout her foreign trade. But in every other point he is most explicit. The excessive weight of the revenue derived from land and of the salt-tax, the iniquity of making India pay for wars in which she has no concern, the waste of her resources in military expenditure are all dealt with adequately, nor is Mr. Gooch imposed on by the official claptrap about the extravagance of the people and the excessive growth of population. As for the political grievances he boldly declares that "nobody who has known Indian gentlemen, whether Mohammedan or Hindu, with their European culture, their perfect command of English, their capacity for work, and their loyalty to the British connexion, but feels that their permanent exclusion from public life is the one thing in India that may be safely pronounced impossible."

Mr. Chamberlain has taken the right course in refusing to sanction the Act passed by the Queensland Legislature to prohibit the employment of Asiatics and other coloured labourers in sugar mills receiving financial help from the Government. In reply to a question in the House of Commons he stated the position of the Government as follows:—

> His Majesty's Government have represented to the Queensland Government that the Bill in question is open to objection on grounds both of principle and of policy; first, because it embodies a disqualification based solely on place of origin, and would therefore exclude British subjects in India and elsewhere, not on account of any moral, educational, or physical deficiency, but solely on difference of race and colour; secondly, that it is offensive to Japan, a friendly Power, inasmuch as it not only excludes Natives of that country from employment, but also places them in the same category as Asiatics generally, without any consideration being paid to their state of civilization.

Our concern here is with the Indian, not the Japanese, question. We sympathise cordially with our colonists in the economic and other difficulties produced by "Chinese cheap labour." But it is intolerable that British colonies should exclude British Indians as such. A world-wide Empire involves difficulties which must be faced, not shelved.

We learn from the "Colonial Indian News" (May 24), published at Pietermaritzburg, that the Natal Parliament is busy with a Bill for the extension of the Indian Immigration Act to Zululand. The object is to subject British Indians in Zululand to the laws that oppress British Indians in Natal. Elsewhere we deal with this subject generally, and we hope that the Colonial Office will soon find ways and means to recall Natal legislators to a better sense of their Imperial duty.

We print elsewhere a tolerably full report of the amazing discourse delivered by the Bishop of Calcutta at Oxford (June 9). We commented on a somewhat brief report of it last week. Now we return to it to notice one astonishing argument. Bishop Welldon seems to base Indian loyalty on Christianity. He says:—

> Wherever a Native of India, Mohammedan or Hindu, was converted to Christianity, there was made or won a loyal subject to the Crown. The reason of the loyalty—he did not want to make too much of it—was not unintelligible. Not only did conversion mean that the Natives stood in a new relation of sympathy to their rulers, but it meant that if the non-Christian religions of India were to get the upper hand, and especially Islam, the lives of the Christians in India would not be worth a very long purchase. It was therefore to the interest as well as it was the duty of all Native Christians to remain loyal to the Crown, and they had proved their loyalty in the great agony of the Mutiny.

He places the loyalty of Christian Indians on a basis of interest—namely, that their throats should not be cut by Mahomedans, in the hypothetical event of Mahomedans getting the upper hand, and wanting to abolish everybody else. How can he possibly say that the loyalty of Indians in the Mutiny was based on their Christianity? Besides, his argument appears to involve a progressive weakening of its validity as the process of Christianisation advances. It is time for some good friend of Bishop Welldon to tell him frankly that he is playing with fire, as well as misreading history, prejudicing the educative work of missionaries, and adding to the perplexities of statesmanship. The best friends of England in India are loyal, with or without Christianity as the case may be; and the Bishop and his

friends had better have a care that their mistaken zeal do not lead to results that they little bargain for.

The case of the poor woman who, having been forced to alight from the train for plague-examination, was then left behind was still under the consideration of the courts when the mail left, the charge of assault which she preferred not having been decided. But it has had the good effect of turning the attention of the authorities to the inconveniences of the arrangements hitherto prevailing. Up to now, all the Indian passengers have had to alight at the station where the examination was to take place and stand in a line along a rope. There they were examined by the doctor, and had at the end to scramble back into their seats, often with the result that some were left behind. The "Tribune" suggests that they should be examined in the train, and only those who show signs of plague be forced to alight.

The plan that has now been introduced does not follow the lines suggested by the "Tribune." In so far, however, as it does away with examination on the platform, it is a great gain. Under the new rules the name of each passenger and his address at his destination are to be taken down by the inspecting officer and posted to the Deputy Commissioner of the district to which he is going, who will then depute a subordinate to keep watch over the new arrival till all danger of his developing plague is past. One great point, according to the "Tribune," is that this watching should not be entrusted to the police. That would be fatal to the success of the new plan. It is suggested that the district and medical officers, if they are in sympathy with the people, will have no difficulty in obtaining volunteers for this work.

We read in the "Tribune" numerous complaints of the sufferings of travellers at Lahore station, especially in their being subjected to erroneous accusations by the police; and one of these is declared to have led to a very improper action by a police officer, who on May 19 cancelled the charge register sheet on his own authority. Now it is distinctly laid down that once a charge has been entered, whether rightly or wrongly, it can be cancelled only by the order of the district magistrate, and this is evidently necessary in order to prevent any tampering with cases or records by the police. The "Tribune" is anxious to know why the entry was made, and what led to its being cancelled.

The question of the chief judgeship of the Burma Chief Court will apparently be on the tapis again, in consequence of the pending retirement of the present Chief Judge. Last year, the Government of India appointed a member of the Civil Service to the post, in the teeth of what the Rangoon correspondent of the "Times" (June 16) properly calls "a unanimous public protest." The advantages of having a trained lawyer were then overborne by the supposed necessity of having a chief judge that could inspect the district courts with technical civilian knowledge. To any one that appreciates the value of the best administration of justice available, the reason did seem rather extraordinary. But it will no longer work, even on plausible appearances. For the Rangoon correspondent states that "during the fifteen months the Chief Judge has been able to make one inspecting tour only," and that during the long vacation, "and he has since delegated the work to a puisne judge." What is wanted is the best lawyer to be got for the money.

Six months' hard labour, though it may be a fitting sentence, is hardly one to provoke friendship in the recipient. Yet Mr. Minus, the district magistrate of Rangoon, gave this as his reason for inflicting such a punishment. A Chinaman, secretary of a Buddhist Society, was charged before him with insulting an English artist named Middleton, and was given six months' hard labour and bound over to keep the peace for a year. The magistrate declared that his object was to create a feeling of amity between Englishmen and Natives. The Sessions Judge on appeal confirmed the sentence but for a different reason. As a Calcutta contemporary puts it he sent the Chinaman to gaol because in the event of a fracas the Burmans might have used knives. The sentence may have been justifiable, though it seems heavy for a case of insult. But the reasons given in support of it are certainly curious.

We regret to chronicle the death of H. H. the Begum of Bhopal, G.C.S.I. In spite of difficulties arising from the unfortunate conduct of some of her agents a few years back, the Begum was a strong ruler during a generation. The Government of India, in a "Gazette" extraordinary notifying her death with "profound regret," acknowledges that "she administered her country with marked ability and success, was distinguished for her liberality and benevolence, and maintained undimmed the loyal traditions of her house"; also that she was "a just and considerate ruler." She is succeeded by her daughter, the Nawab Sultan Jahan Begum, her only child by her first husband. The new Begum was married in 1874 to Ahmad Ali Khan, a member of the Afghan clan, from which the Bhopal family is descended. One can wish her no better fortune than to follow in the footsteps of her mother.

We take the following appreciation of Mr. A. M. Bhimjee from an article (with portrait) in the "Scottish Reformer" (June 15):—

> Mr. Bhimjee has addressed several meetings in Glasgow with great acceptance. He speaks with great fluency and force. Few foreigners have such a command of the English language as he exhibits in his public addresses and in conversation. He has a pleasant and affable manner, and his courtesy and gentlemanly bearing make him extremely popular with those who have had the pleasure of making his acquaintance.

An unfortunate case in connexion with plague comes to us from Karachi. The "Phœnix" had commented on the removal of certain persons, including a woman in the very pains of delivery (who died subsequently, and her child as well), and an action for defamation was brought by the plague inspector, Dr. Haji, against Mr. Jaffer Fuddoo, the proprietor of the journal, resulting in a sentence that seemed even to the Sudder Court on appeal to be "somewhat heavy." There appears to us to be no doubt that the comments were written and published in good faith, though it must be admitted that a different view might honestly be entertained. Unfortunately they were not free from exaggeration and insinuation, and they were based on reports of what had happened which were not sufficiently borne out in evidence, while the facts, as alleged and supported by the prosecution, were essentially antagonistic. The truth probably is that there was a great deal of misunderstanding among those present at the time of Dr. Haji's visit: what Dr. Haji says was "advice" merely was taken as, or said to be, an "order" of evacuation, while Dr. Haji insisted that he expressly directed that the woman should remain. One cannot but feel sympathy for Mr. Jaffer in the circumstances; and Dr. Haji's case presents elements that do not invite favourable consideration. But it ought to be plain enough that statements involving serious imputations should not be made in print, much less should stringent and suggestive criticisms be passed, without a very definite knowledge of the real facts, and besides that the means of adequate proof in case formal legal proof should become necessary. Such requirements press very hard, we know, on an Indian editor; still there is no protection but care and vigilance. It is a position where the most honest intentions in the world will not by themselves be sufficient for safety. The social view disclosed in the case gives painful indications of the condition of the wretched people under the plague.

Remittances on India for 50 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs. 40,51,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3⅞d. to 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds. The following amounts were allotted—viz., in bills, Rs. 19,12,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 13,39,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3.906d.; and one lakh of telegraphic transfers on Bombay at 1s. 3.968d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds and for transfers at 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds will receive in full. Last week remittances for Rs. 50,35,204 were sold for £338,718, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 6,03,46,035, producing £4,003,730. Next week the amount to be offered will be reduced to 45 lakhs.

WAITING FOR MR. CHAMBERLAIN.

THE forthcoming settlement in South Africa—for we must presume that the new administration will get to business before very long now—will furnsh a fair test of the quality of our vaunted Imperialism. The treatment of our British Indian fellow-subjects in that region has occasioned much adverse comment. There have been difficulties, as every fair-minded observer has acknowledged, in the way of official action for the relief of the sufferers and the redress of grievances; but now it is quite clear that the Colonial Office will have a free hand, and, we trust, a firm hand. The independence of the Volksraad no longer stands in the way in the Transvaal; and the course of recent events also places the Colonial Secretary in a favourable position for speaking an authoritative word of truly Imperial significance to such of our South African colonists as have not yet been able to extend their political vision beyond a narrow local horizon.

Let us look for a moment at the case of the British Indians of the Transvaal. We have already dealt at some length with the disabilities imposed upon them by the Government of the South African Republic, without effective protest on the part of the Colonial Office, or rather with its easy acquiescence. But the war sent most of the Transvaal Indians over the border into Natal—though the selfish action of Natal officials added to the miseries of many by an enforced detour by Delagoa Bay. Then came a time when the refugees from the Transvaal thought they could return and take up their various businesses. Some were allowed to return, but a heavy embargo was laid upon Indians. Sir M. M. Bhownaggree raised the question of this discrimination in the House of Commons on May 14. In reply, Mr. Chamberlain read out a communication on the subject from Sir Alfred Milner. What was the substance of this statement? Sir Alfred admitted that such refugees were allowed to go up as were "required for re-opening of mines and for necessary trade." But surely that limitation could not on equal terms justify the detention of Indians. Surely there were Indians working at the mines or engaged in necessary trade. Yet the Indians were not excluded: the Indian Committee's telegram was "incorrect." For "two representatives of Indian traders have been given permits, one from Durban, one from Cape Town." One Indian trader, then, on this official statement, was the solitary Indian permitted to go from Natal to the Transvaal! Why this discrimination against our Indian fellow-subjects? Mr. Kruger's hand could hardly have been heavier than Sir Alfred Milner's. The true reason—or, at any rate, one reason—immediately follows. "All civil permits to men issued on condition that recipients join Rand Rifles. This," says Sir Alfred, "does not seem advisable in case of Indians, and to allow them up without this restriction would cause great discontent." The conduct of British Indians in the Natal campaign shows clearly enough that returned Indian refugees would have readily joined the Rand Rifles, and done any necessary military duty with alacrity and efficiency. But their admission "does not seem advisable." No reason is alleged. What reason could possibly exist? No reason would occur to a genuine soldier: witness the firm friendship and warm mutual regard of Highlanders and Gurkhas. What can be the inference but that the European civilians have been allowed to dictate an insulting discrimination against Indians? We look to Lord George Hamilton. Did he not say (May 22) that "the chief thing to remember is that British influence to be supreme must rest on Native sentiment and Native esteem"? If this sound principle is good for India, it is equally good for South Africa; and we have no doubt he will diligently inculcate it on the Colonial Office. At the same time does not Lord Lansdowne's "blood boil" at the indignity?

Let us turn now to the case of the Indians that failed to get out of the Transvaal on the outbreak of the war. The position of these was described in vivid terms by a correspondent, writing from Durban on April 20 (INDIA, vol. xv., p. 248; May 24, 1901). "If the present regime is any test of the future," he wrote, "then indeed the question has been solved for them to the horror of every Indian in South Africa. The whole of the anti-Indian legislation in the Transvaal is being enforced with a rigour unknown before." Mr. Kruger had his severe location law, his car regulations, his footpath and other bye-laws; but he did not actually enforce the location law against "respectable" Indians, while "the storekeepers and others, and only a few—very few—actually suffered the indignity of the footpath and other bye-laws." True, he threatened; but he limited his action. Such a position was irksome and degrading enough. But now "all is changed. Every anti-Indian ordinance by the late Government is being unearthed, and with strict British regularity applied to the victims." These are allegations of a painful character. They make Mr. Chamberlain's little finger thicker than President Kruger's loins. They turn Kruger whips into Chamberlain scorpions. And what says Mr. Chamberlain? Sir M. M. Bhownaggree asked him (May 24) whether he would authorise the British administrators in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony to declare publicly that all the old regulations imposing disabilities on Indians should have no effect from the date when these territories passed under British domination. Mr. Chamberlain's reply was that meantime the Transvaal legislation "remains in force until modified," that he "has not yet learnt the views of the new Administration as to the changes to be made in regard to the regulations in question," and that he "proposes to discuss the matter with Sir Alfred Milner." Already nearly a month has passed, and we have no information as to the conclusions arrived at in the intended discussion. It will be remembered that Mr. Chamberlain expressed his sympathy with the Indian memorialists as to the location law; that he said he believed the British Indians "to be a peaceable, law-abiding, and meritorious body of persons," men of "undoubted industry and intelligence and indomitable perseverance"; and that he indicated his intention, "later on, to make friendly representations to the South African Republic as to these traders, and possibly to invite that Government to consider whether . . . . it would not be wise to review the situation from a new point of view, and decide whether it would not be better in the interests of its own burghers to treat Indians more generously." We do not now discuss his intended action, but merely look to the trend of his ideas, and point to the fact that the British Government is now in the shoes of the Volksraad, and that what would have been good for the burghers then cannot be less good for the citizens of the same territory now. Furthermore Mr. Chamberlain now has the haft and the blade in his own hand and can cut through any difficulties at his will and pleasure.

The opportunity of an unhampered decision in the newly annexed territories, it may be anticipated, will be used to give an authoritative example to the self-governing colonies in South Africa, with which the Secretary of State cannot easily do more than remonstrate, though recent events, as we have indicated, have really put him in a position that ought to render a remonstrance equivalent to a command. Anyone that reads the White Paper (383.—Sess. 2: 1900) of "Restrictions upon British Indian Subjects in British Colonies and Dependencies" will see (pp. 36-63) how extensive and how severe are the disabilities imposed in Natal. The fact that most of them are imposed indirectly constitutes no mitigation of their severity. When an Act is passed to prevent theft of cattle by the Kaffir population, one is scarcely prepared to connect the Indian population with it; yet under the Cattle Stealing Act, No. 1 of 1899, "Indians are made subject to those parts of the Act by which the possession of a permit or pass is necessary to authorise the removal of cattle from place to place"! Again, under Act. No. 21 of 1888, as to the registration of servants, any time-expired indentured Indian taking service in Pietermaritzburg or Durban without being registered is liable—and so is his employer—to a fine of £2, with an alternative of imprisonment! Further, under Act No. 28 of 1897, an Indian not introduced under indenture—and, it may be, a well-to-do and cultured merchant—must take care to provide himself with a "pass," otherwise, if he chance to be arrested as a deserting servant, "he will not have a remedy in damages." The tortuous ways of Natal legislation are, moreover, well exemplified in Act No. 8 of 1896, which "excludes from the Parliamentary franchise"—not Indians "eo nomine,"

nothing so crudely offensive—but "Natives of countries which do not possess elective institutions founded on the Parliamentary franchise, and the descendants in the male line of such Natives"—unless indeed they "obtain from the Governor in Council an order exempting them from the operation of the Act." How many, we wonder, have obtained such an order? But we must refer our readers to this remarkable White Paper itself—a document crammed full of the very antitheses of a rational Imperialism. Now Natal may be confidently expected to be invited by the Secretary for the Colonies to revise its notions of the place of a British Colony in a system of British Imperialism. It may also be gently reminded of the opportune aid it received in its extremity from the Indian Army—British soldiers indeed, but soldiers maintained at the expense of the compatriots of the local Indians; and it may well recall the services of the Indian stretcher-bearers, which were at one time lauded and honoured in Durban. It is so easy to forget; but the memory of Natal will be jogged.

The Indians may, we think, rely on the best consideration of Mr. Chamberlain. We have quoted his sympathetic expressions to the Indian Memorialists. Let us also recall a sentence or two of his speech at the conference with the Colonial Premiers in the summer of 1897. Mr. Chamberlain is reported then to have applied the traditions of the Empire to this case in the following terms:—

> The United Kingdom owns as its brightest and greatest Dependency that enormous Empire of India, with 300,000,000 subjects, who are loyal to the Crown as you are yourselves, and among them are hundreds and thousands of men who are every whit as civilised as we are ourselves, who are, if that is anything, better born in the sense that they have older traditions and older families, who are men of wealth, men of cultivation, men of distinguished valour, men who have brought whole armies and placed them at the service of the Queen, and have in times of great difficulty and trouble, such for instance as on the occasion of the Indian Mutiny, saved the Empire by their loyalty. I say you who have seen all this cannot be willing to put upon those men a slight which I think is absolutely unnecessary for your purpose, and which would be calculated to provoke ill-feeling, discontent, irritation, and would be most unpalatable to the feelings not only of her Majesty the Queen but of all her people.

In the same speech Mr. Chamberlain laid down clearly the only legitimate grounds of State objection to alien immigration. Taking the general historical view above quoted and that specific intimation of the true lines of legislation in such a case as the present, we cannot but bid our Indian friends in South Africa hope. But we trust that Mr. Chamberlain will not delay an unnecessary hour in effecting a just, satisfactory, and Imperial settlement.

FACTS AND HALLUCINATIONS.—II.

> "I do not for a moment doubt your wish to serve India, but to effectively perform any work of that kind facts must be faced and hallucinations dismissed."—Lord G. Hamilton to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, December 6, 1900.

THE HALLUCINATION:—

That the charge of the India Office is borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom.

THE FACT:—

"The charge of the India Office is at present borne entirely by India." (Report of the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Expenditure of India, 1900, para. 233.)

This charge includes, of course, the salary of the Secretary of State, which therefore does not come upon the Estimates and does not afford, as the salaries of other Ministers afford, occasion for debate in the House of Commons.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure proposed (Report, para. 233) that £50,000 a year should be contributed by the British taxpayers towards the cost of the India Office. "It is," the Commissioners stated, "a fact that the Colonies do not contribute to the charge of the Colonial Office, and in order that there may be no ground for allegation that India is treated less favourably than other parts of her Majesty's Empire, we recommend that Parliament should be asked to make a contribution towards the charge of the India Office."

This recommendation, however, was nipped in the bud by the India Office.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

There was a significant scene in the House of Commons last Monday. At the close of an angry debate on the concentration of Boer women and children in camps of refuge, Mr. William Redmond gave voice to his resentment against the application of the closure in the cry, "You are stifling the children." The Speaker sternly called the member for East Clare to order, warning him that the expression was irregular. Thereupon, Mr. Redmond defiantly repeated the offending phrase. Naturally enough, the Tory members began to shout "Name," looking meanwhile to the Speaker for some drastic assertion of his authority. Mr. Gully remained passive. "You are murdering the women and children," exclaimed Mr. Redmond passionately. "You are bringing dishonour on the name of England. You may name me if you like. I am not afraid of being named. Shame on you! You ought to be ashamed of yourselves." The Ministerialists were frantic with indignation. Again and again they raised cries of "Name," and still the Speaker ignored alike their exhortations and Mr. Redmond's irregular expressions.

Doubtless Mr. Gully acted for the best. If Mr. Redmond had been "named" some of his compatriots would probably have claimed a similar distinction, and a series of suspensions or expulsions might have ensued which would have created a mischievous impression in every part of the civilised world. But the contrast between this attitude of passive contempt and the Draconic severity with which a less flagrant exhibition of contumacy was punished earlier in the Session was most marked. The incident suggested obvious inferences—too obvious to be overlooked by the sharp-witted Irish members. Mr. Balfour may or may not be lessoned by the experience. Thanks to the coolness of the Speaker, he was saved from the retribution which his facile and indiscreet invocation of the closure had invited. What would civilization have said if the news had gone abroad that in order to stifle debate on the alleged inhumanities of our "camps of refuge" the British Government had been compelled to expel its critics from the House of Commons?

Nothing could be more deplorable than the temper in which Ministers dealt with the subject. Mr. Lloyd George, who initiated the discussion, did not mince words. He had to relate the facts, and they were facts that made the simplest terms sound strong. But in his appeal to Mr. Brodrick he employed the language of entreaty, and expressly acquitted the Government and its agents of intentional inhumanity. His reward was a lecture from the Minister for War on the excesses of partisan spleen. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman's moderate and dignified appeal for some modification of the rigours of camp detention was received with Ministerial laughter, while Mr. Herbert Lewis could only make himself heard above the unmannerly interruptions of his opponents by shouting what he had to say at the pitch of his voice. Despite those provocations, a number of Liberals actually abstained from voting.

In some quarters the action, or rather the inaction of those weak-kneed brethren is hailed as the prelude to a new Liberal secession. Mr. Asquith's inclusion in the cave is regretted. The ex-Home Secretary was conspicuous at the outset of the war for his insistence on a policy of magnanimity. To vary Mr. Morley's phrase, he seems to have forgotten that he was ever opposed to the war. Curiously enough, Sir Henry Fowler did not use his vote, either actively or by abstention, to weaken the Liberal position. He was paired against the Government, so that although he did not vote himself the loss of his support was counterbalanced by the loss on the other side of a Ministerial vote. Mr. Perks also was paired, and so was Mr. Mellor, who, according to some erroneous reports, voted against the motion. The only member of the Opposition who went into the Ministerial lobby was Sir John Austin, while the number of abstaining Liberals, exultantly computed by the "Times" at fifty, was actually less than a score.

Lord Milner's nationality, like the birth of Jeames Yellowplush, may be "wrop in mistry," but he is now a member of the House of Lords, and invested with all the privileges of his order. The ceremony of introduction was

singularly unpretentious. It took place in an almost empty chamber, the only members of the Government who graced the occasion being Lord James of Hereford and Lord Hardwicke, the Under-Secretary for India. Some comment has been evoked in the Parliamentary lobbies by the action of the officials at the table in suppressing a question of which Mr. William Redmond had given notice, enquiring whether the new peer was a naturalised British subject. Lord Milner was born in Germany, went to school at Bonn, and came to this country when he was about fourteen.

A few days ago, Mr. Balfour informed the House of Commons that the British troops in South Africa had no longer to contend with an organised adversary. This variation of the familiar boast about the war being over was greeted with ironical cheers. Those who mocked were only anticipating the irony of the telegraph wires. On Sunday night came a message from Lord Kitchener reporting the defeat of a force of 250 Victorians, with a heavy loss in killed and wounded, and the capture of stores, ammunition, and two "pom-poms" by a surprise party of Boers. Although merely an incident of the war the reverse happened at a singularly inopportune moment. It has served to put fresh heart into the Boers, to discount whatever effect Mrs. Botha's "mission" might have had in inclining ex-President Kruger to counsels of peace, and also, no doubt, to harden the determination of people at home to pursue the fight "to a finish." Incidentally, it has also had the effect of eliciting from Mr. Brodrick an acknowledgment that the war is still in progress.

Although the result of the electoral contest at Stratford-on-Avon is a foregone conclusion, the Liberal candidate will probably effect a considerable reduction in the Conservative majority. The names and also the supposed characteristics of some of the villages in the division are described in the famous old quatrain:—

Piping Pebworth, dancing Marston,
Haunted Hillboro', hungry Grafton,
Dodging Exhall, Papist Wixford,
Beggarly Broom, and drunken Bidford.

The successful candidate, besides representing the localities thus vividly characterised, will enjoy the honour of sitting for Shakespeare's country. At present the literary traditions of the district are maintained by Miss Marie Corelli, who wishes them to be represented in Parliament by a Liberal spokesman, and is accordingly canvassing for Mr. Bolton King.

Three of the greatest actresses in the world are to be seen in London this week. Madame Sarah Bernhardt is still playing to crowded houses at Her Majesty's Theatre, while Madame Rejane has opened a short season at the Coronet Theatre with an adaptation of Daudet's "Sapho." The third of the trio is Madame Sada Yacco, the little Japanese lady whose superb histrionic genius shines with a lustre scarcely to be diminished even by the fact that it is expressed in a language unknown to European audiences. Sada Yacco is spoken of as a Parisian discovery. This is scarcely fair to the critical discernment of London. Long before she took Paris by storm the Japanese tragedienne had attracted the astonished homage of the English critics, and as this happened when she was appearing at a suburban theatre the circumstance not only enhances the actress's personal triumph but also redounds somewhat unexpectedly to the credit of dramatic criticism.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE EVE OF THE MONSOON.

MORE AGRARIAN LEGISLATION.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, June 1.

There is a lull in Indian affairs, partly owing to the ennui of the season on the eve of the monsoon. That event now absorbs attention. It is upon the annual rainfall that the well-being of the State and the fairly contented condition of the tillers of the soil to no small extent depend. Sorely stricken as we have been during the last five years our apprehensions of another bad monsoon are aggravated.

The official optimists are growing in number. The latest is Mr. Tozer, who, under the ægis of the India Office, waxed so eloquent at the Society of Arts on India's foreign trade, ignoring the fact that that trade is mostly in the hands of alien capitalists. These optimists never care to analyse what is the true Indian trade, nor how much even of the Indian trade is shared by the subjects of Native States.

Two days ago there was introduced at Mahableshwar a Bill which ostensibly seeks the amelioration of the condition of the Bombay peasant. It looks innocent. But hidden in the innocent sections is a weapon the point of which will only be felt when the new law comes into operation, as no doubt it will, thanks to the "mandate" majority which constitutes our local Legislative Council. The aim of the measure is to restrict the right of the landholder to alienate his land. This is attempted under the representation that it is for the good of the proprietor who, being generally improvident, cares not how soon he mortgages his property or even sells it outright to the money-lender, and becomes a tilling slave. But I am sceptical about Indian agrarian legislation. The Government appears to believe that the panacea for the ills of the Indian peasant is legislation. As if a paper remedy could ever cure those ills! Mr. H. J. S. Cotton, Chief Commissioner of Assam, writing on the condition of the Indian rayat in his 'New India,' observed that when the rayat wants bread the State provides him with an ample store of legislative stones. The more these land laws have encumbered the Statute Book the more the peasantry has been bowed down with misery and indebtedness. How much better off would the peasantry have been in Bombay had agricultural banks been flourishing amongst us. Lord Cromer's agricultural measures in Egypt have brought a happy change in the condition of the fellah. In Egypt these banks, with the limited support of the State, are flourishing and levelling up the fellah who was so down-trodden only fifteen years ago. Is it impossible for the Indian Government with its immense resources to achieve what Lord Cromer had achieved single handed?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

"INDIA IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY."

To the Editor of "India."

Sir, If Messrs. Horace Marshall and Son have any care for their character as publishers they will, without delay, recall the book they have recently issued entitled "India in the Nineteenth Century." The writer is Mr. Demetrius C. Boulger, who is described on the title page as "author of 'The Story of India,' 'The Life of Lord William Bentinck,' etc." No firm of publishers can be desirous of the reputation of issuing works which are so misleading as to be untruthful—least of all new-comers of such high reputation as the publishers of this book. You have already in India pointed out some inaccuracies in it. I will justify my demand—a demand made in the interests of truth and justice—for the withdrawal of Mr. Boulger's book on the contents of two pages only, pages 328 and 329. I opened the leaves at random at this place: I have looked at no other pages—I have no intention to submit myself to the annoyance caused by the perusal of manifestly untrue statements. These two pages are enough for me, as, doubtless, they will be enough for others also. Here are a few examples of the way in which Mr. Boulger writes history:—

(a.) "The wheat cultivation is practically a new development of less than twenty years' existence."

Wheat cultivation in India is thousands of years old. What is meant, probably, is wheat "export." Twenty-seven years ago 1,755,954 cwts. were exported against 1,910,626 in 1896-7 and 2,392,607 in 1897-8.

(b.) ". . . . and that (cultivation) of cotton was introduced during the American civil war."

Cotton "cultivation introduced during the American war." The statement is ridiculous on the face of it. So long as cotton-manufactured clothes have been worn in India, so long has cotton been cultivated in that country. Perhaps that great antiquarian in Indian affairs, Sir George Birdwood, could say how many thousands of years that is. Here, again, I suspect Mr. Boulger means "export." Let me take it as export. So doing, I find that in 1806 the East India raw cotton imported into England was about one-tenth of the whole imports of raw cotton. At the present time out of 14,520,000 cwts. annually imported into England India contributed, in 1898-99 (the latest year available), only 411,884 cwts. That is, proportionately to bulk imported to this country India now supplies less than one-thirtieth against one-tenth nearly one hundred years ago. Obviously we could not "introduce cotton cultivation" into India "during the American war," that is, after 1861, if we in England imported, as we did in 1796-7 £1,323,594 worth of cotton manufactured goods from Bengal, £1,031,109 of the same kind of goods from Surat—all by the East India Company—and over £400,000 worth more by private and neutral trade. Together these totals amount to £2,754,703, and of the total export of India in that year this was

more than half. And, yet Mr. Boulger, desiring to give England credit for its great and beneficial services to India, declares that, sixty years later, we "introduced" cotton "cultivation" into that country!

(c.) "The lightness of the taxation of land may be inferred from the fact that the area under cultivation has doubled in forty years."

The exact statistics as to area under cultivation for 1860 are not available. The land revenue in that year, however, is ascertainable: it was £18,760,000; in 1880, it was £22,340,000. We are able to test the extension since 1880. It has been:—

	ACRES.
In 1897-98 - - - -	196,497,232
In 1880 - - - -	182,750,000
Increase - - -	13,747,232

Allow a like increase, or, say, 15,000,000 acres, from 1860 to 1880—really an outside limit—and we have, roughly, 29,000,000 acres. This would give, in 1860, 167,500,000 acres. "The area under cultivation has doubled in forty years," says Mr. Boulger.

	ACRES.
Area cultivated in 1900 (According to Mr. Boulger)	335,000,000
Area actually cultivated in 1897-8 - - - -	196,500,000
Below Mr. Boulger -	138,500,000

And in 1860, the area in square miles of British India was 854,000. In 1897-8 it was 965,000 square miles. Increased territory: 111,000 square miles, or 71,040,000 additional acres through annexation. Meanwhile, the "lightness of the taxation on land," which according to Mr. Boulger has doubled the area under cultivation in forty years, presumably the area governed by the British in 1860, plus the annexations, has resulted in an increase of 12 per cent. instead of one hundred per cent.

(d.) ". . . . owing to increased irrigation and improved means of transport, production per acre has become larger."

Only in respect to irrigated land, even now one-sixth of the whole cultivated area merely, has there been increased production. On five-sixths of the cultivated land the out-turn has become less, and, owing to the increasing poverty of the cultivator, is becoming still less year by year. This is one of the patent and most painful economic facts in present-day India.

(e.) "Among material benefits conferred on the peoples of India, none surpasses the cheapening of salt in price."

This statement is so grossly inaccurate, while the ignorance exhibited is so discreditable, that—"To the law and to the testimony."

"The rate of duty on salt is Rs. 2½ per maund (82⅔ lbs.), except in Burma, where it is Re. 1 per maund" (Stat. Abstract of British India, No. 34, p. 103).

The foregoing relates to this present year of 1901.

Let me show how the "cheapening" compares with one hundred and twenty-nine years ago—1772.

"Agreeably to the above plan, the following salt farms have been let for five years:—

"24 Calcutta Pergunnas from over 45,50,000 to 50,00,000 maunds at 70 Arcot rupees per 100 maunds."

(Similar for Burdwan, Dacca, Jessore).

"It affords us particular satisfaction to observe that . . . . the value of this necessary of life is not enhanced to the poor inhabitant." (Extract of the Revenue Letter from Bengal; dated December 30, 1772.)

Thus, "the material benefit conferred upon the people" of "cheapened" salt stands thus:—

	ANNAS.		ANNAS.
In 1772, per maund (or the seventh part of one penny per lb.)	11⅓	In 1901, per maund (or one halfpenny per lb.)	40

That is: salt is now three and a half times dearer than it was when we began our rule in India. This is Boulgerian "cheapening" and is Mr. Boulger's idea of a "material benefit" conferred upon the Indian people by England. This instance is taken from British times. If one goes further back—to the era before any drain of the country's resources had taken place, the cost of salt was much the same. In the reign of the Emperor Akbar salt cost about one farthing per seer (2 lbs.) and the annual requirement of each adult was put at 24 lbs. At that time, too, food grains could be obtained at the rate of 200 lbs. to the rupee where often to-day not much more than 20 lbs. can be purchased for the same amount.

(f.) ". . . . and the provision of that article is in sufficient quantities to reach every household in India."

"Sufficient quantities." What is a "sufficient quantity"? When a landholder in India has means enough he buys salt for household consumption at the rate of 20 lbs. per head per annum. (In England, allowing for manufacturing purposes, the average consumption is 70 lbs. per head). What do the official statistics in India show, as the consumption per head, including manufacturing purposes, cattle, etc?

Total consumption in 1898-9: 35,769,581 maunds.

Turn that into lbs. at 82⅔ lbs. per maund, and we have 2,942,048,037 lbs. Divide that by 223,000,000 inhabitants of British India in 1900, and you have a little more than 13 lbs. per head for all purposes against 20 lbs. per head for food, which are purchased when there is money enough in the household. "Sufficient quantities"! Two-thirds of even a minimum supply if it all went to the people!

(g.) Still salt: "It is computed that the rate of consumption to-day is fifty per cent. higher than it was twenty years ago." Away from this fancy to facts.

	MAUNDS.
1879-80—Total consumption - - -	28,797,977
1898-9 —Total consumption - - -	35,769,581
Increase - - - - - -	6,971,604

Thus the Statistical Abstracts, Nos. 24 and 34. Now for Mr. Boulger:—

	MAUNDS.
1898-99—Total consumption - - -	35,769,581
1900 —Total consumption, according to Mr. Boulger - - -	43,196,965
Exaggeration - - - - -	7,427,384 Mds.

Mr. Boulger is only 610,902,334 lbs. ahead of the fact! And during that period many millions of people have been added to the Empire by annexation, including the lightly (one-rupee-per-maund) taxed Burmans, who consume per head at least 18 lbs. per annum.

Here I must stay my hand. All the above most egregious blunders are contained within the space of sixteen lines. If the rest of the book is written with the same attention to facts the publication is undoubtedly a monumental production. It must contain more incorrect statements than any other work ever known.

The most serious aspect of the matter is not as to how it may affect Mr. Boulger or his publishers, but as to how it affects the people of India. Here is a work specially produced to instruct the English people, who want to know what is the actual condition of things in India. Issued under such auspices as it is, readers have a right to believe they may take the description of things Indian as they are here depicted and order their conduct towards India accordingly. It is hardly possible to conceive of grosser wrong being done to a subject people. Instead of the condition of India being depicted through clear glass it is shown through a distorted medium, and we all proceed to think and act under the influence of this distortion.

The barest justice that Messrs. Horace Marshall and Company can do to the much-suffering Indian people is to immediately withdraw it from circulation. This, in the name of fair play, I presume to call upon them to do. Yours, etc.,

London, June 15. WM. DIGBY.

EUROPEANS AND INDIANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

Sir,—In the correspondence between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Lord George Hamilton published in your issue of May 24 last the Secretary of State for India has said: "I am most sincerely anxious to do everything I can to benefit India, and I cordially welcome co-operation from any quarter. I really admit there may be flaws in our system, and that in various branches of legislation, administration, and research improvements and innovations may be instituted of value and advantage. But I attach even more importance to promoting cordial and sympathetic relations between Europeans and Natives, between governors and governed."

In an article under the heading "Governing the Orient on Western Principles," by Professor Paul S. Reinsch, in the "Forum" for June, 1901, there is a passage which is not only of great significance to India, but coming from one who is not an Indian it is of great value and importance in connexion with the quotation from his lordship's letter. He says:—"European jurors refuse to convict a white man guilty of the murder of a Native. These juries are mostly composed of men of the lower middle class, among whom the arrogance of the imperial race is most potent and apparent. The Native papers, as a result, constantly inveigh against the rulers of the country for giving themselves practical immunity from the law."

This widens and aggravates the existing differences. It is the golden thread of justice and righteousness that binds India to this country. Yours, etc.,

London, June 14. P. J. DAMANIA.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated June 12:—

Famine.—Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 384,000; Bombay Native States, 43,000; Baroda, 27,000; Haidarabad, 19,000; Madras, 5,000; Central India States, 4,000; Central Provinces, 2,000. Total, 484,000.

Distress in Bombay has been much less than was apprehended. Prices fell during the spring, and, though now prices show a tendency to rise, they are 50 per cent. below those of May, 1900. In Gujarat grain everywhere obtainable at 16 seers per rupee, and in the Deccan and southern districts at 12 or 13 seers.

In Deccan percentage of population on relief is—Ahmednagar, 13; Sholapur, ten; Bijapur, Poona, six; elsewhere, small; in Gujarat—Kaira, Panch Mahals, six; Ahmedabad, four; elsewhere, small.

Total number on relief works and gratuitous relief only 40 per cent. of that anticipated, and estimate of famine ex-

penditure this year reduced by Bombay from over one crore to Rs. 34,50,000.

With present range of prices number on relief works may be expected to decline rapidly if monsoon normal and meteorological forecast is justified.

BOMBAY, June 13.

The monsoon has burst.—Reuter.

The "Investors' Review" (June 15) writes:—The Viceroy tries to cheer us by quoting prices for grain and stating that the total number on relief works and in receipt of gratuitous relief is only 40 per cent. of that anticipated, and that the estimate of famine expenditure is this year reduced by Bombay from over one crore of rupees to 34,50,000. With the present range of prices, he adds, the numbers on relief works may be expected to decline rapidly if the monsoon is normal, and the monsoon has burst. We shall wait to see what kind of a rainfall it is before beginning to rejoice.

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is deducted for advertisement in newspapers or any other kind of charges, may be sent to A. J. Wilson, at this office; cheques to be crossed "Union Bank of London, Indian Famine Fund."

Amount previously acknowledged	£953 6 2
Westbourne Park Indian Circle, per J. W. B. Chapman	0 17 2
Total to date	£954 3 4

The "Investors' Review" of June 8, after summarising the latest telegram, proceeded:—And what is Lord Curzon doing? If we may judge by an article from his pen in this month's "Nineteenth Century," his whole energy is occupied in getting up, at the cost of at least £300,000, a sort of Walhalla, or "Hall of Fame," in Calcutta, for eminent Anglo-Indians, at the cost principally of the Native Princes of India, as a memorial to the late Queen-Empress. "I shall hope," he declares—we quote from the "Morning Leader's" extract—"by assiduous research and by appeals to those who are capable of rendering assistance to lay the foundations of the collection." It will need the most untiring activity on the part of the Viceroy to carry plans into execution at Calcutta. So our supreme representative in the Indian dominion is turning himself into a begging-letter writer, not for any good purpose, not to help the starving people of India, but for pure vanity, the gratification of a childish pride as worthy of contempt as that of any Mohammedan caliph or Byzantine emperor. The spectacle would be supremely ridiculous were not interests so vital to England at stake, did not the incongruity and indecency of the thing excite anger and disgust. If we now lose our dominion in India, it cannot be said with such an exhibition of cultured effeteness before us that we have not deserved our fate. But Lord Curzon, though more responsible for his folly, is in no wise more apathetic than the bulk of the people in this country, who seem perfectly content that India should drift to ruin, a ruin covered by magniloquent phrases and optimistic budgets, framed in the neighbourhood of the moon, pomposities about "a governing race and its mission," and other unmistakable marks of approaching dotage.

THE CASE FOR ENQUIRY.

The "Speaker" of June 8 published an article on the Famine, signed "G. H." The writer, after setting forth the latest available facts, concluded as follows:—

In these circumstances special interest attaches to the report of the Famine Commission which was appointed at the beginning of the year. Sir Antony MacDonnell and his colleagues have issued their report, which is now in the hands of the Government of India. Why is it not also in the hands of Parliament and the public? The Simla correspondent of the "Times" telegraphed on May 20 that its immediate publication was "unlikely," because it was to "form the subject of a Government resolution also to be forwarded to the Secretary of State." The "non sequitur" is equally manifest and curious. That a Government resolution on the subject should be sent to the India Office is eminently proper and desirable. But how would the resolution be prevented or delayed by the immediate publication of the report? It is to be feared, however, that the report will at best prove a disappointing document. There are two main problems which famine offers to a Famine Commission. One is, How can famine be prevented? The other is, When famine occurs how best can relief be given? Discussions in India and in the House of Commons about famine have for many years turned chiefly on proposals for an enquiry of the first kind. In 1897, for example, when India was in the grip of the last great famine, the Secretary of State was urged more than once in Parliament to authorise "a full and independent enquiry into the condition of the masses of the Indian people with a view to ascertain the causes by reason of which they are helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence." The proposal was not accepted. But Lord George Hamilton used words which clearly suggested that enquiry of the kind would be undertaken. "I agree," he said, "that the opportunity this famine affords ought not to be allowed to pass without our taking every opportunity to enquire into and ascertain the best methods of protecting the people of India from the recurrence of similar calamities." That was said on January 26, 1897. Later in the same year a Famine Commission, of which Sir James Lyall was President, was appointed. But the reference to the Commission practically limited its investigation, not to the fundamental question of prevention, but to a revision of the relief system. The report of Sir James Lyall's Commission was consequently a series of suggestions for the amendment of the Famine Code. It might have been expected that when another famine called for another Commission the all-important problem of prevention would not be overlooked. Yet that is precisely what has happened. The resolution of the Government of India upon the appointment of the Commission which has just submitted its report set forth under five heads the subject-matter of the investigation. They deal from first to last with the relief system. The business of the Commission is to yield "valuable results in the treatment of future famines." The recurrence of famine is postulated. The only practical question is assumed to be how best famine can be grappled with when it comes. True, in a sort of postscript to the reference it was stated that "the Commission will not be precluded from recording any recommendations or opinions which it is thought may be of use either in anticipation or in treatment of future famines." But that vague and permissive statement, even if it can be supposed to refer at all to the prevention of famine, does not meet the necessities of the case.

There was, however, one passage in the Government's resolution upon which it does not seem unreasonable to found hopes of a further and more searching investigation. Lord Curzon said that he had addressed the various local Governments and Administrations upon "the larger question of the incidence and pressure of the land assessment in the different provinces, and its effects on the well-being and resources of the agricultural population." A study of their replies would "enable him to decide whether further investigation is necessary." Meantime "it would be manifestly undesirable to postpone the labours of the present Commission." These words may fairly be said to imply at least the possibility that another Commission might be appointed. But, if so, it may be hoped that its enquiries will not be limited to questions connected with the land revenue, important as they are. What is really wanted is a "stock-taking" not less thorough than that which periodically and automatically preceded the renewal of the charter of the East India Company. The remedial measures to which these "stock-takings" habitually led are landmarks in the history of British India. But since 1858, when the government of India passed from the company to the Crown, there has been no such enquiry. Prominent statesmen were ready enough to examine the record and mend the ways of a trading company. But under the direct government of the Crown a new set of considerations has come into play. Where is the Burke or the Bright who is willing now to oppose himself to the accumulated interests and optimism of forty years of bureaucracy? The big guns are silent. India is handed over to "bores" and "faddists"—bores who believe in the golden rule, and faddists who will not admit that even in the climate of the Indian plains two and two make five. Yet, amid the silence of the India Office, the apathy of Parliament, and the consequent indifference of the public, there are signs enough and to spare that all is not well with India. Famine recurs with increasing intensity at intervals that grow shorter. The census returns tell a plain tale. Nor is uneasiness diminished when the Secretary of State tells the House of Commons (July 26, 1900) that "there is always a sufficiency of food in the great continent of India even in years of drought." How many millions, one begins to wonder, have died of hunger whom three-halfpence a day would have kept alive? How is it possible to contend that enquiry into the economic causes of famine is superfluous at a time when millions perish through starvation though there is food at low prices ready for them if only they had the means to buy it? It has sometimes been urged in the House of Commons that, though such an enquiry might be interesting, it is too difficult to throw upon officers who have more urgent work to do. To that contention there are three answers. The first is that the enquiry might be made manageable, without detriment to its usefulness, by the selection of a limited but truly typical area. The second is that such enquiries, though for local, special, and temporary purposes, have actually been made—witness Mr. Thorburn's admirable report on peasant indebtedness in part of the Rawalpindi division. The third is, that no Anglo-Indian officer need have his duties interrupted. There are plenty of retired officials competent and willing to undertake the work.

THE INDIAN FAMINE UNION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

Sir,—At a preliminary meeting held on the 7th instant at the Westminster Palace Hotel a provisional committee was formed for the purpose of organising an "Indian Famine Union," and on behalf of that committee we now ask you to enable us briefly to explain the purpose of the movement and to appeal to the public for sympathy and support.

Our special object is to investigate the causes of Indian famines and to promote all possible means of prevention. We recognise the energy and skill with which the Government of India has during famine times performed its stupendous task of feeding millions of starving sufferers scattered over a vast area, and we believe that the various famine commissions, by careful scrutiny of past results, are gradually bringing our system of famine relief to the highest point of efficiency. We do not therefore consider it necessary to include methods of famine relief within the scope of our enquiry. But there remains the question of famine prevention. Here all possible help is needed to collect facts and mature practical suggestions. And we

believe that this help will be welcomed by the overworked officials in India, whose time is fully occupied by the current duties of administration. There are in this country many persons—retired officers, civil and military engineers, business men, and missionaries—who have special experience of India, who sympathise with the Indian people, and have spare time at their disposal. Our object is to utilise this experience, good-will, and leisure for organised work, so as to bring practical aid to the Government of India in tracing the causes of these recurring calamities and in devising means of prevention. We are also anxious to obtain help and advice from the leading authorities in economic science, with a view to dealing on sound principles with the difficult problems involved in safeguarding a vast and scattered agricultural population.

The first point is to ascertain in detail the present condition of the Indian cultivator and the origin of his difficulties, and this can only be done by a special enquiry conducted under the orders of the Government of India. An exact diagnosis of the patient must precede the application of remedies. We therefore propose to begin our work by moving the Secretary of State to grant this special enquiry. We then propose to form sub-committees to enquire into and report upon the various suggested remedies—e.g., irrigation, agricultural banks, village industries, reafforestation, migration, grain storage, export duties on grain, technical education, arbitration courts, administrative reforms—already before the public, in order that the Government of India may have the support of an enlightened and organised public opinion in dealing with the problem of famine prevention, as distinguished from famine relief.

It is premature to specify the precise structure which is proposed for the Union, as to which we shall see our way clearer when the effect of this public notice has been ascertained. The British public by their liberal support of the Indian famine funds have proved their desire to mitigate Indian suffering. But prevention is better than cure and much better than mitigation. We trust that as a national duty they will respond to this appeal.—Yours, etc.,

LEONARD H. COURTNEY,
Chairman Provisional Committee.
W. WEDDERBURN,
S. S. THORBURN,
M. M. BHOWNAGGREE.
Joint Hon. Secs.

June 14.

Note.—Communications may for the present be addressed to "Indian Famine Union," care of Sir W. Wedderburn, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

*** The foregoing letter was circulated to the Press, and has appeared in the following, among other, journals:—The "Times," the "Morning Post," the "Daily Chronicle," the "Morning Advertiser," the "Daily Graphic," the "Morning Leader," the "Manchester Guardian," the "Manchester Courier," the "Daily News," the "Glasgow Herald," and the "Western Morning News."

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE "MORNING LEADER."

We are glad to see that the Indian Famine Union, which was so happily inaugurated on June 7 under the presidency of Mr. Leonard Courtney, is appealing to the public for "sympathy and support." The Union has nothing to do with party politics. Its aim is to investigate the causes of Indian famines and to promote all possible means of prevention. Famines are becoming more frequent and more severe in India, a phenomenon which, as Lord Hobhouse truly said the other day, points to a cause less variable and more deep-seated than the clerk of the weather. We have no right to say that famine is inevitable until we have exhausted the means of searching out the truth. Co-operation from home in this endeavour will no doubt be welcomed by over-worked officials in India, and the Union seeks to turn to practical account the enormous wealth of Indian experience which is now accumulated in this country. It seeks also the help and advice of leading economists, and the driving power which popular support alone can give. The first practical step is a special enquiry, which Lord George Hamilton will be asked, and which he will doubtless be eager, to grant. The British public, as the founders of the Union observe, have by their liberal support of Indian Famine Funds proved their desire to mitigate Indian suffering. But prevention, which is better than cure, is incalculably better than mitigation. It follows that the public should, as we trust it will, respond heartily to the appeal of the Famine Union.—(June 18.)

THE "STAR."

We hope that the Indian Famine Union, which has been formed to fight Indian famines on the lines of prevention rather than cure, will receive a vigorous backing from the whole community. It is not a creature of party politics. The appeal on its behalf which appears in the "Times" this morning is signed not only by Mr. Courtney and Sir William Wedderburn, but by so confirmed a Unionist as Sir M. M. Bhownaggree. Its one object is to get to the hinterland, so to speak, of the famine phenomena, and to discover the sources of those recurring visitations which are the curse of India. Lord George Hamilton has himself told us that "there is always a sufficiency of food in the great continent of India even in years of drought." What the Famine Union will try to investigate is the cause which is preventing that "sufficiency" being properly utilised. It will, therefore, ask for an enquiry into the condition of the Indian cultivator. It will form sub-committees to examine the various suggestions that have from time to time been proposed in the cultivator's interest, and will do its best to create an "enlightened and organised public opinion in dealing with the problem of famine prevention as distinguished from famine relief." It is an object well worthy of a sane and wholesome Imperialism.—(June 17.)

THE "SHEFFIELD INDEPENDENT."

It is beyond all doubt that those whose duty it is to administer our Indian Empire do their utmost to mitigate the evils of the famine which periodically afflicts the country. Their efforts to grapple with the famine and overcome it are skilfully organised and ably directed; and the labour is performed with an energy and a devotion which are an honour to our race. The result is that the ravages of the famine are by no means so terrible as they would be if it were not systematically dealt with. But none the less the famine is an appalling scourge, and if means could be found of preventing its recurrence altogether a vast amount of suffering would be avoided and a heavy burden would be lifted from the shoulders of the Indian authorities. Famines have been fought and conquered, but the struggle entails terrible loss; and no one has yet discovered a way of prohibiting the return of famine. Unless such a way be discovered famine will come again and again to India, with all its attendant sorrow and misery. The problem of curing famine is hard enough to solve, as every Indian civil servant knows; the problem of preventing it is harder still. But there are those who believe that prevention ought not to be considered impossible; and an endeavour is being made to organise an Indian Famine Union for the purpose of taking seriously in hand the question of the prevention of famine. This body is, of course, non-political; the Chairman of the Provisional Committee which has been formed to initiate the movement is Mr. Leonard Courtney, and its secretaries include a pronounced Liberal in Sir William Wedderburn and a prominent Unionist in Sir M. M. Bhownaggree. The object of the Union is to investigate the causes of Indian famine, and to promote all possible means of prevention. It is proposed that retired civil and military officers, engineers, business men, and missionaries who have special experience of Indian life, and who sympathise with the Indian people should be asked to give their assistance in the work of determining the causes of famines and suggesting remedies. It is also hoped that advice will be obtained from leading authorities on economic science. The first step which it is intended to take is to move the Secretary of State for India to grant a special enquiry into the present condition of the Indian cultivator and the origin of his difficulties. Sub-committees will afterwards be formed to report upon the various remedies—irrigation, village industries, grain storage, and so on. The education of public opinion on the subject is an aim which the Union will have constantly before it. The organisation certainly deserves the most cordial sympathy and support. Its purpose is the extinction of an evil which causes misery on a more stupendous scale than any scourge of modern times. Its victims are numbered, not by hundreds or thousands, but by millions; and all who know the horror and agony that an Indian famine involves would look upon its prevention as the greatest of blessings to our Indian Empire. The work that the Indian Famine Union has been created to undertake is a most humane and beneficent one, and all who value the prosperity of India and the welfare of its huge population will wish success to its efforts.—(June 18.)

THE "GLASGOW HERALD."

The avowed intentions of the gentlemen who met in London the other day to establish an "Indian Famine Union" are undoubtedly excellent. They want to find out, if they can, the economic causes of Indian famines, and to discover, if such a thing be discoverable, the means of preventing them. But whether their Union will accomplish anything beyond the production of a great amount of rhetoric, oral and printed, there is very strong reason to doubt; and unless its operations are conducted with a prudence and reticence which there is not much reason to expect, it may easily do more harm than good to the very class of Indian peasant-cultivators whom its promoters are especially anxious to benefit. There is, it may safely be said, very little to be learned about the causes of Indian famines which is not already to be found in the archives of the Viceregal and Provincial Governments. Those causes are primarily not economic at all, but atmospheric, or it would perhaps be more correct to say meteorological. When the monsoon rains fall seriously short of an average in any part of India, the inevitable consequences in the area so affected are drought, failure of crops, and consequently famine. It is an unfortunate fact that the vast majority of the Indian agricultural peasantry are normally so very close up to the limit of their resources that they have no reserve to fall back upon when their crops fail, and therefore a scarcity is a far more terrible and wide-spread calamity among them than it would be in a highly organised community like our own. But to denominate this state of things an "economic cause" of famine is surely a misuse of terms. And one reason

for looking with mistrust on the projected Famine Union is that some of its active promoters belong to that class of Anglo-Indian politicians who hold, for reasons which they never condescend to put into plain language, that the bad economic condition of the Indian cultivator is due to the "laches" of the British rulers of the country; so that there is some ground for apprehending that the investigations they propose to make will be more or less guided and coloured by this underlying theory. That it is utterly untenable ought to be manifest to any impartial student of Indian history. There can be no doubt whatever that the condition of the rayat was infinitely worse under the old Native Governments than it is under ours. Taxation was heavier, and its incidence was unequal and capricious. The revenue it produced was, as a rule, employed for the benefit not of the community at large, but of despotic Princes and their luxurious Courts. The idea of expending their resources on behalf of their distressed subjects in times of scarcity was scarcely ever entertained—or at any rate acted upon—by the Native rulers. For many centuries before the establishment of British rule the great works of irrigation which had been carried out in the days of the earlier civilisation had been allowed to fall into decay, and nothing had been done to supply their place. Peace and order were the exception, instead of as now being the rule, in every part of India. All these are obvious and notorious facts. What they mean is that the material condition of the vast mass of the population has been greatly improved under British administration, and yet there are people, prominent among the organisers of the new Famine Union, who insist that this very administration is really responsible for the disastrous consequences of the periodic scarcities which visit the land. That the power of the people to endure and resist such visitations is not so great as could be wished nobody will dispute. But it is much greater now than it was a hundred or fifty years ago, and is constantly increasing; nor is there the least probability that the investigations of the Famine Union will throw the smallest light on any of the actual phenomena connected with the subject, which has engaged for many years past the anxious study of the most efficient Civil Service in the world.—(June 11.)

"Belfast News-Letter."

The Union which was inaugurated at Westminster Palace Hotel yesterday with the object of investigating the causes of famine in India will have the sympathy of all who have the welfare of the Empire at heart. The periodical recurrence of seasons of scarcity in India, involving on the Government the necessity of providing food for the sufferers, has long been one of the chief difficulties of the Indian Administration. The causes, it is felt, are to be sought not so much in the peculiarity of the climate of the country as in the economic conditions under which the people live, and the evil should, therefore, be preventible. The important question is in what way a reform in these conditions may best be brought about. As the members of the new union are men of special experience in Indian affairs, and will co-operate with the Government, it is hoped that their investigations will result if not in a complete solution of the difficulty, at least in some method being found of anticipating and diminishing the effects of the famine.—(June 8.)

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, June 13.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

INADEQUATE CULVERTS ON THE BENGAL RAILWAYS.

Lord Stanley of Alderley said: As I put down a notice as long ago as last November respecting the inadequate culverts of the Bengal railways, I may expect that the India Office will now be fully prepared with a satisfactory answer. I owe an explanation to the House, why this notice was withdrawn and replaced on the minutes, and for my own sake also I desire to make it. The first information I had of the culverts being inadequate was taken from a Hindu paper which complained only of the Bengal Central Railway, and led me to suppose that only the immediate neighbourhood of Dum-Dum barracks was affected. I then thought that whilst English engineers of the Public Works Department had proved so inefficient the recent limitation by the Secretary of State for India of two annual appointments of Indian students from Cooper's Hill College was neither justifiable nor well-timed. Then there occurred the incident of the dismissal of the seven professors from Cooper's Hill. Lord Kelvin and others eminent in science complained of this, and blew the iron to white heat: it had therefore to be struck before it grew cool, and I wrote a letter on the subject to the "Morning Post," in which I said that this letter would answer the purpose of the notice, which I then withdrew from the minutes. In that letter I complained of the Secretary of State for India for having trampled upon the Queen's proclamation of 1858, by his assertion that Cooper's Hill was established for the teaching of English boys. I complained of his denouncing the instruction given at Cooper's Hill, whilst he and his predecessors in the India Office had repeatedly praised that institution on the annual occasions when the Secretaries of State made a speech to the College, and to the successful candidates for employment in the Indian Public Works Department. I do not remember ever to have read in any of the valedictory speeches delivered at Cooper's Hill any admonition to the students as to their responsibilities, or warning what to avoid when transferred from college to the attractions and temptations of life in an Indian station. I was at the last meeting of the East India directors with the students of Haileybury, and remember how the directors endeavoured to impress upon the young men the duties and responsibilities they were about to incur. If the present Secretary of State is unequal to this task, and indeed he has disqualified himself by his collision with the teaching body, he had better entrust this duty to Lord Kelvin or to some other man of science. About a month after I had withdrawn my first notice I learned that the mischief caused by bad engineering was very much more extensive than I had at first supposed. The Eastern Bengal Railway as well as the Bengal Central Railway both traverse land which slopes towards the Bay of Bengal, and obstruct the escape of the rain water, so as sometimes to cause the water to lie eight or nine feet deep on the upper side of these railways; on the lower side of the railway towards the sea the water courses deprived of their former flow of water get silted up, the country is waterlogged, sodden, and fever-stricken. I have read that as much as 32 square miles of land are affected by this interference with the natural drainage. Public meetings have been held and memorials have been forwarded to the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal in December last. Since then in April questions were asked in the Bengal Council by Mr. Bose as to the inadequate water-ways, and most unsatisfactorily answered by Mr. Buckley who said "the water-ways were provided to meet normal flood, and an entirely unprecedented flood such as that of last year could not be met at any reasonable cost." This answer is inaccurate since the flooding of the land occurs every year, and the village of Sinthee has suffered from malaria since the railways were constructed. Besides when are floods normal? When is nature normal? Those who know Scotland must know how spates vary in volume, yet in that country there are not such heavy downpours to be provided against as occur in the tropics. I consulted an English civil engineer as to the injury caused by inadequate culverts, but without mentioning India or the extent of the land affected. A Bengal Civilian had written to me, "They (the Railway Co.) do not care for fever, and they do care for expense," and in writing to my friend I had shortened this into "They prefer fever to expense." The engineer replied that he knew of a case where land had become boggy, but that any proceedings to obtain a remedy would cost more than the land was worth; and advised a friendly application to the traffic manager. He also evidently thought an English Company was in question, perhaps the Great Northern, as part of it skirts an aguish country, and he urgently advised me not to say they preferred fever to expense. The Bengal Government appears to be less sensitive, and if it persists in doing nothing it must accept the verdict that it prefers fever to expense. If the Under-Secretary of State for India will engage that additional and sufficient waterways shall be immediately provided, I will withdraw the motion. Otherwise he will have to negative it, and further destroy the claims of the Bengal Government to any care for the health and well-being of its subjects. I now come to the last question on the notice paper: what steps the India Office will take to improve the Public Works Department or the engineering work in India. That this Department is bad and requires improvement is undeniable. It is usually called the Public Waste Department in India: as long as I can remember it has constantly been said that barrack walls erected by it fell in, that railway bridges fell down. The fact of Cooper's Hill College having been established about 30 years ago shows that the engineering in India was defective. In this country there is no other school for civil engineers than Cooper's Hill College. In this country engineers learn their profession, as architects and lawyers learn theirs, by entering the offices of men already eminent in those professions. English engineers and their work stand highest in the world. It is enough to mention the Eddystone Lighthouse, the Tubular Bridge, and the Forth Bridge. Why then should the Public Works Department of India be so far behind the engineering of this country? A short time ago a Hindu gentleman was with me looking at the Holyhead breakwater, the upper part of which has not required any renewing since it was constructed. I asked him why the Public Works Department of India could not turn out work like that. He replied: because they are not responsible to any one, and they have no sympathy with the people of the country. This I believe is the real reason, for they do not belong to the Civil Service, they are paid less, and lately some of them have complained that they have not received the pay that was promised them. The system of educating them is bad; they do not gradually work their way up through the offices of civil engineers who already possess established reputations; they come out from Cooper's Hill with theoretical knowledge only, and like too many of the Civil Service are put into places of responsibility and requiring experience at too early an age. The condition of the Bengal railways proves the great want of engineering knowledge and skill or of zeal since the original defects of these railways have not been remedied. One of these railways was constructed before Cooper's Hill was established, the other a good deal later. The Secretary of State has admitted the inefficiency of the Public Works Department since he has considered that it might be advisable to close Cooper's Hill. Some of the earlier failures of barracks and bridges may have been due to their having been entrusted to the Royal engineers, who had been educated for military works and not for civil engineering. I asked a friend who had been 20 years ago at Bombay what he remembered of this. He replied that he remembered the failure of barracks and bridges, and that the Cooper's Hill men derided the sappers for these failures. But the Cooper's Hill men have not done any better since, as shown by the Bengal railways, and the wish of the Secretary of State to abolish them. One of Mrs. Steel's books, "The Potter's Thumb," is in part a pamphlet against the Public Works Department. One remedy would

seem to be that in future for any work of importance an English civil engineer of reputation should be appointed, and that he should be provided with a staff of Indian subordinates, who would naturally have an interest in the country, and as they would remain in India would be interested in the durability of the works they were engaged upon. In short the recent limitation of two appointments annually to Indian students at Cooper's Hill should be reversed, and appointments of Englishmen to the Public Works Department limited, and as many Indian pupils of Cooper's Hill employed as possible. Both for railway and canal works, knowledge of the language and sympathy with the inhabitants are necessary in order to acquire the necessary knowledge of what is normal, and especially of what is exceptional in floods, but yet which must be provided against. All are agreed that a larger number of Indians must be admitted into the Civil Service of their own country—because they expect it, because the proclamation of 1858 must no longer remain a dead letter, because the pensions spent out of the country are helping to bring India to bankruptcy, because the engineering profession is the one in which the fewest objections can be made to the admission of Indians. Race prejudices or partialities cannot be shown in civil engineering as in administrative posts, and there is no connexion between engineering and sedition. He moved: "That, in the opinion of this House, an enquiry should be made as to these defects, and remedies suggested by an independent commission of engineers assisted by a civil officer well acquainted with the language and local conditions." He also asked what steps the India Office proposed to take to improve the Indian Public Works Department.

The Earl of Hardwicke, in reply, stated that there was an unprecedented rainfall in Calcutta and the surrounding district in September last, the rainfall between the 19th and 22nd amounting to 38.6in. Such a rainfall had never been known there before. It was not, therefore, remarkable that certain culverts were found inadequate to carry the water away; but, even if there had been no railway existing at all, the inconvenience and damage would have been equally severe. How the noble lord arrived at a population of five millions he was at a loss to understand. Dum-Dum was a very short distance from Calcutta, the inhabitants of which were under one million, while the population of the adjacent villages was somewhere about 400,000. The damage in Calcutta was far in excess of any resulting from the inadequacy of the culverts. The Government of India at once instituted an enquiry into the supposed inadequacy of the culverts, with the result that an additional 40 lineal feet would be added to the waterway over a distance of 1¼ miles, and this would be done at the expense of the company. He hoped this statement would satisfy the noble lord.

The motion was withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Progress and Condition),—Copy presented,—of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1899-1900. Thirty-sixth Number (by Act); to lie upon the Table.

BOERS AT AHMEDNAGAR.

Mr. William Redmond asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been directed to the statements in the official gazetteers of India respecting the positions and sanitary conditions of the town and fort of Ahmednagar, now being used as a Boer prison: Whether he was aware that Major Gambier, R.E., reported in 1873, after the drainage operations, that all who lived in the fort, both Europeans and Natives, suffered from fever; and that, in consequence, all troops were withdrawn from inside the fort and quartered in barracks built outside it: And, seeing that the mortality of Ahmednagar town was 79.75 in 1899, 55.04 in 1896, and 61.63 in 1897, and that the mortality of children under one year of age was 524.89 in 1899, against an average in that year of 196.97 for the whole Bombay Province, whether he would consider the advisability of the removal of the Boer prisoners to some other station.

Lord G. Hamilton: There is no intention of removing the Boer prisoners from Ahmednagar Cantonment, which is one of the healthiest and most popular garrison stations in India. Major Gambier's report is 27 years old, and was made before the sanitary improvements were effected which have since made the fort salubrious. The mortality statistics quoted are misleading and include urban areas outside the town. During the famine of 1899 there was a heavy mortality amongst the distressed people who flocked into the town from the drought-affected districts.

INDIAN SOLDIERS AT TIENTSIN.

Mr. Charles Hobhouse asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could give the House any information relative to the disturbance between the French troops and Native Indian soldiers at Tientsin, on Wednesday, 5th June.

Lord G. Hamilton: Sir Alfred Gaselee has informed me that the report of the disturbance referred to is without any foundation.

THE NEW FRONTIER CHARGE.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay Papers upon the Table of the House relating to the formation, and future administration, and financial arrangements of the new Indian Frontier Province: Whether he could arrange for these Papers to include a map showing the exact boundaries of the Province: and whether the Papers could be laid upon the Table before the discussion on the Indian Budget takes place this present Session.

Lord G. Hamilton: I will present further papers to Parliament, and I will also arrange to include a map showing as far as possible the boundaries. But I cannot fix the date for presentation since I have not yet received a reply to my despatch dated December 20,1900, and when I do receive it the details will require careful consideration by myself in Council.

THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA ON BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

We referred briefly last week to some remarks of the Bishop of Calcutta at a meeting in support of the Oxford and Cambridge Hostel at Allahabad, held on Sunday, June 9, in the Hall of Magdalen College, Oxford. The "Oxford Chronicle" (June 14) reports Dr. Welldon as follows:—

The Bishop of Calcutta said he was not so sanguine as some people seemed to be about the disposition of the Natives of India towards the British Government. If he might speak quite candidly, there had been and there was a very strong feeling for the late Queen and Empress of India; there was not a very strong feeling for the British Government, but wherever the Native of India was converted to Christianity there was made or won a loyal subject to the Crown. Not only did the conversion mean that the Natives stood in a new relation of sympathy to their rulers, but it meant that if the non-Christian religions of India were to get the upper-hand, and especially Islam, the lives of the Christians in India would not be worth a very long purchase. It was, therefore, the interest, as well as it was the duty, of all Native Christians to remain loyal to the Crown, and they were loyal, and they had proved their loyalty in the great agony of the Mutiny. Another reason for the work of Christian Missions in India was in those dreadful customs, particularly the customs of the Hindu religion, which existed in unbroken continuity so long as Hinduism possessed the upper-hand, which had been abolished by the Christian Governments of India, and which he was sorely afraid, if Hindus were left to themselves, would nearly all be restored to-morrow. He hoped he was not doing an injustice to the more enlightened Natives of India, and especially of Bengal, but he was not convinced that practices like suttee or infanticide would be put down by Native nations apart from the authoritative decision of the British Government. It was, therefore, a matter of urgent vital importance that the Natives should be brought as far as possible, and as soon as possible, out of their own beliefs into the spirit or atmosphere of Christianity. The inevitable and actual result of British government in India was to destroy Native beliefs. The educational system, utterly secular as it was, had this effect. There was no Mahomedan or Hindu youth who passed through the Government schools and colleges but emerged from them with his religious belief either undermined or gravely impaired, and with his belief went too often such morality as his own religion inculcated. He looked with the gravest apprehension on the educational problem in India. When statesmen and administrators who came home from India, or still more, who had never visited India, affirmed that the British government of India was an unqualified success, he could only say that they used language which filled him with amazement. What the British government had done for India was to ensure law and order and justice. Heaven forbid that he should under-rate the magnitude of that splendid achievement, but when law and order and justice were ensured, the British Government stood face to face with more arduous problems, of which it might or might not hold the solution, but of which they had not exhibited a solution up to the present time. Looking forward to the future of India, he did not think there was any alternative before that country except Christianity or atheism. It was in Christianity that the East and West were most likely to find their meeting ground. There were certain things it was impossible to deny or mistake, and the sympathy of Christians for the people of India, parted as they were from them by race, by religion, by colour, by habit, was an impressive fact which the Natives of India were beginning to understand as the fruit of the Christian faith. There were many signs of a winning cause; he could not speak to them of them all. But the influence of Christianity upon the Natives of India was even more indirect than direct; there was an awakening of the Native conscience. Not long before he left Calcutta he received a memorial from a number of Native gentlemen, all, or almost all, non-Christians, and they asked him to use his influence to support an effort they wished to make for putting an end to some Hindu practices which they had begun to feel immoral, so-called holy festivals, and the exhibition of the dances, or, as they were called in India, the nautches. He thought that memorial was a remarkable sign of the times, and he did not think anyone could look upon it without feeling that the awakening of a moral sense amongst the non-Christians was the indirect effect of the Christian teaching. He cordially commended the Hostel to their support. (Applause.)

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.
Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.
Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.
The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.
A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.
India and the General Election (1900).
"Melancholy Meanness."
The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.
No National Contribution?
The "Slimness" of the India Office.
"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:
Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage.

Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

In India, applications should be addressed to
Mr. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

is what its name implies

FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari. Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., & 4 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND
27 SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England :—
July 1 to End of Year (Post free), 5s.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.